

United States Patent and Trademark Office



pc

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 02/26/2003

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/394,918	09/13/1999	JAU-YUEN SU	EM/SU/4973	5130	
759	90 02/26/2003				
BACON AND THOMAS			EXAMINER		
625 SLATERS I ALEXANDRIA	LANE 4TH FLOOR ., VA 22314		FLORES SANCHEZ, OMAR		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3724		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				MŦ			
	Application No.	A	pplicant(s)	1 1			
	09/394,918	s	SU, JAU-YUEN				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	A	art Unit				
	Omar Flores-Sán	-	724				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 L</u>	December 2002 .						
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□ Th	is action is non-fin	al.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>7 and 9-13</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>7 and 9-13</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Application Papers							
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.							
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.							
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		1500 0 440/-> /	D (0)				
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).							
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	- h h						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).							
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.							
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) 🔲 🗆	Interview Summary (P Notice of Informal Pate Other:					

Application/Control Number: 09/394,918

Art Unit: 3724

1

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to applicant's amendment received on 12/06/02.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 13, it is not clear what "two opposing lateral rows of cutting marks... positioned between the longitudinal and lateral rows of the cutting marks" encompass.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

- 4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:
 - (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C.

Art Unit: 3724

122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

5. As best understood, claims 7, 9-11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shimizu et al.

Shimizu discloses the process including a strip 100 having a plurality of substrate areas, providing a plurality of alignment marks 18a (Fig.3A), providing a plurality of cutting marks 2 (Fig.3A), positioning the saw machine with respect to the substrate area, cutting each individual substrate areas (Fig. 1A).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu et al. in view of Drussel et al,

Shimizu discloses the method substantially as claimed except for two substrate strips juxtaposed for cutting. However, Drussel teaches the use of the method of twosubstrate strips juxtaposed for cutting for the purpose of increasing the production. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Shimizu's

Application/Control Number: 09/394,918

Art Unit: 3724

Ç

device by providing the method of two substrate strips juxtaposed for cutting as taught by Drussel in order to increase the production.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 7, 9-11 and 12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The examiner agrees that the 102 (a) rejection is improper, but applicant considered the prior art of Shimizu as relevant art against the invention. For that reason the 102(e) is proper and it is not consider to be a new ground of rejection. Applicant argues that the cutting marks of the invention are different from Shimizu's cutting marks. The examiner considers that Shimizu's cutting marks are used to define the cutting tracks. Also, there is no indication in claims that avoid the used of a pair of cutting marks to define the cutting track.

Conclusion

9. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 3724

ò

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Omar Flores-Sánchez whose telephone number is 703-308-0167. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan Shoap can be reached on 703-308-1082. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9302 for regular communications and 703-872-9302 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1148.

ofs February 24, 2003

> ENNETH E. PETERSON PRIMARY EXAMINER